REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 30, 2008 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the Claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1, 3-5, 13, and 15-27 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claims 2 and 24 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 28 has bee newly added. No new matter has been added and no new issues are raised which require further consideration or search. Claims 1, 3-13 and 15-28 are presently pending.

The Office Action objected to claim 13 for containing a minor informality. Applicants have amended claim 13 to correct this minor informality. Withdrawal of the objection is kindly requested.

Claims 1, 6, 13, 18 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by (3GPP - 3G security, Lawful Interception Architecture and Function Standard). The Office Action took the position that 3GPP discloses all of the elements of the claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1, upon which claims 3-13 are dependent, recites a method that includes identifying a packet of a session to be intercepted based on media component information of the session. The media component information includes a multimedia level session identification and a control level media component identification associated to the multimedia level session identification. The method further includes that if the packet to

be intercepted is identified, providing duplicated packets of the session to an interception management element.

Claim 13, upon which claims 15-26 are dependent, recites an apparatus that includes an identifier configured to identify a packet of a session to be intercepted based on media component information of the session. The media component information includes a multimedia level session identification and a control level media component identification associated to the multimedia level session identification. The apparatus also includes a transmitter configured to provide duplicated packets of the session to an interception management element if the packet to be intercepted is identified.

Claim 27 recites an apparatus which includes identification means for identifying a packet of a session to be intercepted based on media component information of the session. The media component information includes a multimedia level session identification and a control level media component identification associated to the multimedia level session identification. The apparatus further includes that if the packet to be intercepted is identified, providing means for providing duplicated packets of the session to an interception management element.

As will be discussed below, 3GPP fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claims, and therefore fails to provide the features discussed above.

3GPP is directed to a lawful interception architecture and includes other related features, as described throughout the document. Section 5 of 3GPP is directed to an overview of activation, deactivation and interrogation of a lawful intercept process. Section 5.1 (including 5.1.1, 5.1.2 and 5.1.3) of 3GPP discloses rules for

activation/deactivation/interrogation of lawful interception, however, no media components are considered.

Contrary to the teachings of 3GPP, the background portion of the present application discloses that a problem may occur when an illegal interception is performed (see reference to 3GPP Release 6 in paragraph [0008] of the specification). This accidental situation is illustrated in FIG. 1 of the present application, where a user B has two ongoing sessions with a user A and a user C, respectively. Both of the sessions are carried over one PDP context from the user entity of user B to the GGSN of the local network. Assuming, for example, that only user A is to be intercepted, then only the session between user A and B can legally be intercepted. However, since the interceptions currently capture all the data carried by a PDP context and since both sessions are carried over one PDP context, consequently, the session between user B and user C will also be intercepted. This unexpected capturing of the data between B and C is unlawful.

Referring to the newly amended independent claims 1, 13, 27 and new claim 28, a reliable interception of only those sessions which are intended to be intercepted will be achieved. For example, independent claim 1 and similarly independent claims 13 and 27 recite "identifying a packet...to be intercepted based on media component information...the media component information comprising a multimedia level session identification and a control level media component identification associated to the multimedia level session identification." Page 5, paragraph "5" of the Office Action admits that 3GPP does not disclose the above-noted features of the independent claims 1,

13, 27 and 28, which is based on former claims 2 and 14, which are now cancelled and their subject matter incorporated into the independent claims. However, Applicants submit that Oyama fails to cure the deficiencies of 3GPP with respect to the newly amended independent claims 1, 13, 27 and 28.

Oyama discloses charging for services provided in a multimedia session. The multimedia session may be established over a radio access network. The system uses a token which is generated at the start of a session to keep track of session charges for operations performed throughout the session. Oyama does not disclose any type of lawful interception related to the subject matter recited in 3GPP. At best, the subject matter disclosed in Oyama defines a session identifier which can be used for identifying a specific session media flow (see page 6, paragraph [0072]). Although, Oyama discloses a session identifier which can be used for identifying a specific session media flow, Oyama does not deal with lawful interception. Therefore, Oyama does not cure the deficiencies of 3GPP with respect to the pending claims.

In addition to the above noted deficiencies of 3GPP and Oyama. Applicants also submit that these references are not from the same field of endeavor, so that a person possessing ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine 3GPP and Oyama. For instance, 3GPP does note disclose using the media component information in a manner prescribed by the pending claims. Furthermore, Oyama only describes that media components merely exist, but does not provide any information regarding how media components could be used for lawful interception.

3GPP discloses lawful interception architecture and functions. However, the subject matter described by 3GPP does not go beyond the above-noted fundamental 3GPP-related information disclosed in the background portion of the present application. In particular, 3GPP does not disclose "identifying a packet...to be intercepted based on media component information...the media component information comprising a multimedia level session identification and a control level media component identification associated to the multimedia level session identification", as recited, in part, in independent claims 1, 13, 27 and 28.

Section 5.1 of 3GPP may disclose some rules for activating lawful interception, however, no "media component information" is considered. Section 7 of 3GPP discloses the activation of lawful interception for packet data services. Section 7 merely discloses that a packet data communication to be intercepted is selected based on several identities (e.g., MSISDN, IMSI, IMEI) of the same target. However, these entities refer only to the identity of the user, but not to media component information.

Therefore, 3GPP does not disclose all of the subject matter recited in claim 1, and similarly in independent claims 13, 27 and 28. By virtue of dependency, claims 3-12, and 15-26 are also allowable over 3GPP. Withdrawal of the rejection and an allowance of those claims is kindly requested.

Claims 2-6 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over 3GPP in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0068454 to Oyama et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

3GPP is discussed above. Oyama discloses charging for services provided in a multimedia session. The multimedia session may be established over a radio access network. The system uses a token which is generated at the start of a session to keep track of session charges for operations performed throughout the session. Oyama does not disclose any type of lawful interception related to the subject matter recited in 3GPP. At best, the subject matter disclosed in Oyama defines a session identifier which can be used for identifying a specific session media flow (see page 6, paragraph [0072]).

Claims 2 and 14 are cancelled. Claims 3-6 and 15-17 are dependent on claims 1 and 13, respectively, and inherit all of the claim limitations thereof. The combination of 3GPP and Oyama fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 13. Oyama fails to cure the deficiencies of 3GPP and fails to disclose "identifying a packet...to be intercepted based on media component information...the media component information comprising a multimedia level session identification and a control level media component identification associated to the multimedia level session identification", as recited, in part, in independent claims 1, 13, 27 and 28. Thus, the combination of 3GPP and Oyama fails to disclose or suggest all of the claim elements of claims 3-6 and 15-17. Furthermore, claims 3-6 and 15-17 should be allowed for at least their dependence upon claims 1 and 13, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

Claims 7-9 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over 3GPP in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0264200 to Laiho et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

3GPP is discussed above. Laiho discloses lawful interception of multimedia calls. A call initiation is detected via call detection equipment and forward and reverse channel parameters of the call are detected and forwarded to a gateway and transmitted to monitoring equipment. Laiho does not teach or suggest identifying a session to be intercepted based on media component information. Laiho is limited to lawful interception techniques which do not disclose the subject matter recited in the claims.

Claims 7-9 and 19-21 are dependent on claims 1 and 13, respectively and inherit all of the claim limitations thereof. The combination of 3GPP and Laiho fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 13. Laiho fails to cure the deficiencies of 3GPP and fails to disclose "identifying a packet...to be intercepted based on media component information...the media component information comprising a multimedia level session identification and a control level media component identification associated to the multimedia level session identification", as recited, in part, in independent claims 1, 13, 27 and 28. Thus, the combination of 3GPP and Laiho fails to disclose or suggest all of the claim elements of claims 7-9 and 19-21. Furthermore, claims 7-9 and 19-21 should be allowed for at least their dependence upon claims 1 and 13, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

Claims 10-11, 22-23 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over 3GPP in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/046663 to Temoshenko et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

3GPP is discussed above. Temoshenko discloses intercepting a packet based on source and destination address information. Temoshenko does not disclose any type of

packet identification used to intercept the packets. Furthermore, Temoshenko does not teach or suggest identifying a session to be intercepted based on media component information, as recited in claims 1 and 13. Temoshenko is limited to interception techniques based on address information which do not disclose the subject matter recited in the claims.

Claims 10-11, 22-23 and 25-26 are dependent on claims 1 and 13, respectively, and inherit all of the claim limitations thereof. As discussed above, the combination of 3GPP and Temoshenko fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 13. In addition, Temoshenko fails to cure the deficiencies of 3GPP and fails to disclose "identifying a packet...to be intercepted based on media component information...the media component information comprising a multimedia level session identification and a control level media component identification associated to the multimedia level session identification", as recited, in part, in independent claims 1, 13, 27 and 28. Thus, the combination of 3GPP and Temoshenko fails to disclose or suggest all of the claim elements of claims 10-11, 22-23 and 25-26. Furthermore, claims 10-11, 22-23 and 25-26 should be allowed for at least their dependence upon claims 1 and 13, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

Claims 12 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over 3GPP in view of Temoshenko and further in view of Oyama. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

3GPP, Temoshenko and Oyama are discussed above. Claims 12 and 24 are dependent on claims 1 and 13, respectively, and inherit all of the claim limitations

thereof. As discussed above, the combination of 3GPP, Temoshenko and Oyama fail to disclose or suggest "identifying a packet...to be intercepted based on media component information...the media component information comprising a multimedia level session identification and a control level media component identification associated to the multimedia level session identification", as recited, in part, in independent claims 1, 13, 27 and 28. Thus, the combination of 3GPP Temoshenko, and Oyama fails to disclose or suggest all of the claim elements of claims 12 and 24. Furthermore, claims 12 and 24 should be allowed for at least their dependence upon claims 1 and 13, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. These distinctions are more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unanticipated and unobvious. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of the claims 1, 3-13 and 15-28 be allowed, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

Kamran Emdadi
Registration No. 58,823

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

KE:sjm

Enclosures: RCE
IDS
Petition for Extension of Time
Check No. 19741